

1 LORBER, GREENFIELD & POLITO, LLP  
Louis W. Horowitz, Esq. [S.B. #020842]  
2 3930 E. Ray Road, Suite 260  
Phoenix, AZ 85044  
3 TEL: (602) 437-4177  
FAX: (602) 437-4180  
4 [lhorowitz@lorberlaw.com](mailto:lhorowitz@lorberlaw.com)

5 RENZULLI LAW FIRM LLP  
6 Christopher Renzulli, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
7 Peter Malfa, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Jeffrey Malsch, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
One North Broadway, Suite 1005  
White Plains, NY 10601  
TEL: (914) 285-0700  
FAX: (914) 285-1213  
[9 crenzulli@renzullilaw.com](mailto:crenzulli@renzullilaw.com)  
[10 pmalfa@renzullilaw.com](mailto:pmalfa@renzullilaw.com)  
[jmalsch@renzullilaw.com](mailto:jmalsch@renzullilaw.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants Diamondback Shooting Sports, Inc.,  
Loan Prairie, LLC d/b/a The Hub, SNG Tactical, LLC and Sprague's Sports, Inc.*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

## Estados Unidos Mexicanos.

**Plaintiff,**

VS.

Diamondback Shooting Sports, Inc., an Arizona corporation; SNG Tactical, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company; Loan Prairie, LLC D/B/A The Hub, an Arizona limited liability company; Ammo A-Z, LLC, an Arizona limited liability company; Sprague's Sports, Inc., an Arizona corporation,

#### Defendants.

Case No: 4:22-cv-00472-CKJ

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE OR  
FOR LEAVE TO FILE JOINT RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF  
SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY**

## INTRODUCTION

On February 8, 2024, Mexico filed a Notice of Supplemental Authority based on a recent decision from the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, *Estados Unidos Mexicanos v. Smith & Wesson Brands, Inc.*, \_\_ F.4th \_\_, 2024 WL 227773 (1st Cir. Jan. 22, 2024). See ECF Doc. 44. Defendants hereby move the Court for an order striking Plaintiff's Notice of Supplemental Authority from the record. That Notice improperly seeks to present additional argument from Plaintiff about the issues addressed in Plaintiff's briefing on the issues raised by Defendants' Motions to Dismiss, not just a notice of new authority. Defendants object to Plaintiff's Notice of Supplemental Authority and request the Court strike it from the record.

If the Court decides to consider the additional arguments set forth in Plaintiff's Notice of Supplemental Authority and to consider the parties' positions on how this new opinion affects the arguments now before this Court, Defendants seek leave to file a Response to the arguments included in Plaintiff's Notice of Supplemental Authority. *See* Ex. 1 - Defendants' [proposed] Joint Response to Plaintiff's Notice of Supplemental Authority.

## ARGUMENT

Plaintiff's Notice of Supplemental Authority improperly contains legal arguments in further support of its opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

“There is no local rule or Federal Rule of Civil Procedure governing a Notice of Supplemental Authority. However, in this district, ‘[t]he purpose of a Notice of Supplemental Authority is to inform the Court of a newly decided case that is relevant to the dispute before it; it is not a venue for submission of additional argument or factual evidence.’” *Vega v. All My Sons Business Devp., LLC*, 583 F. Supp. 3d 1244, 1256 (D. Ariz. 2022) (quoting *Myers v.*

1 *Freed*, No. CV-19-05683-PHX-SMB, 2020 WL 6048327, at \*1 (D. Ariz. Oct. 13, 2020); *see*  
 2 *also Doe v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ill.*, 492 F. Supp. 3d 970, 980 (D. Ariz. 2020) (“Filing a  
 3 notice of supplemental authority to inform the court of a new judicial opinion that has been  
 4 issued is appropriate, but it is an improper occasion to argue outside the pleadings. If  
 5 Defendant’s goal was to merely inform the Court of this decision, it accomplished that within  
 6 the first sentence. Instead of stopping there, Defendant continued to explain and argue the case  
 7 in detail. Such additional argument is inappropriate, and the court will not consider it.”); *B Street*  
 8 *Grill & Bar LLC v. Cincinnati Ins. Co.*, 525 F. Supp. 3d 1008, 1013 (D. Ariz. 2021); *Hagens*  
 9 *Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP v. Rubinstein*, No. C09-0894 RSM, 2009 WL 3459741 (W.D.  
 10 Wash. Oct. 22, 2009) (notice of supplemental authority improper “because it contained  
 11 argument regarding the case...”).  
 12

13       In fact, this Court has faced a similar situation, and held, “[a]fter the motion to dismiss  
 14 became fully briefed, Union Pacific filed a motion to submit supplemental authority and a notice  
 15 of further supplemental authority. The court has considered the supplemental authority  
 16 submitted . . . and the court will grant Union Pacific’s motion to submit supplemental authority  
 17 to the extent the motion seeks to alert this Court to supplemental authority. However, the court  
 18 declines to consider the substantive arguments set forth in the motion.” *Blankinship v. Union*  
 19 *Pac. R.R. Co.*, CV-21-00072-TUC-RM, 2021 WL 3290453, at \*1 n. 1 (D. Ariz. Aug. 2, 2021).  
 20

21       Here, in the form of a chart, Plaintiff clearly asserts arguments beyond simply notifying  
 22 the Court of the First Circuit’s decision in *Estados Unidos Mexicanos v. Smith & Wesson*  
 23 *Brands, Inc.*, 2024 WL 227773 (1st Cir. Jan. 22, 2024). As such, this submission is improper  
 24 and, at a minimum, the “chart” contained in ECF Doc. 44 should be stricken.  
 25

1 In the alternative, Defendants seek leave to file a Response to Plaintiffs' Notice of  
2 Supplemental Authority for the limited purpose of addressing the issues raised by Plaintiff  
3 related to the First Circuit's opinion. A copy of this proposed Response is attached hereto at  
4 Exhibit 1.

5 **CONCLUSION**

6 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants' motion to strike Plaintiff's Notice of  
7 Supplemental Authority, or, in the alternative, for leave allowing Defendants to file a Response,  
8 should be granted.  
9

10 Dated: February 16, 2024

11 LORBER, GREENFIELD & POLITICO, LLP

12 By: Louis W. Horowitz, Esq.  
13 3930 E. Ray Road, Suite 260  
14 Phoenix, AZ 85044  
15 lhorowitz@lorberlaw.com

16 and

17 RENZULLI LAW FIRM LLP

18 By: /s/ Jeffrey Malsch  
19 Christopher Renzulli, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
20 Peter Malfa, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
21 Jeffrey Malsch, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
22 One North Broadway, Suite 1005  
23 White Plains, NY 10601  
24 crenzulli@renzullilaw.com  
pmalfa@renzullilaw.com  
[jmalsch@renzullilaw.com](mailto:jmalsch@renzullilaw.com)

25 *Attorneys for Defendants Diamondback*  
26 *Shooting Sports, Inc., Loan Prairie, LLC*  
27 *d/b/a The Hub, SNG Tactical, LLC and*  
*Sprague's Sports, Inc.*

1 PISCIOTTI LALLIS ERDREICH  
2

3 By: Anthony Pisciotti, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
4 Danny Lallis, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
5 Ryan Erdreich, Esq. (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
6 30 Columbia Turnpike, Suite 205  
7 Florham Park, NJ 07932  
8 apisciotti@pisciotti.com  
9 dlallis@pisciotti.com  
10 rerdreich@pisciotti.com  
11  
12 and  
13

14 WILSON, ELSE, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN  
15 & DICKER LLP  
16

17 By: Colt B. Dodrill, Esq.  
18 Brian E. Cieniawski, Esq.  
19 Arizona Bar No. 013185  
20 2231 East Camelback Road, Suite 200  
21 Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
22 Colt.Dodrill@wilsonelser.com  
23 Brian.Cieniawski@wilsonelser.com  
24  
25

26 *Attorneys for Defendant Ammo A-Z, LLC*  
27  
28

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Jeffrey Malsch, hereby certify that this document was filed with the Clerk of the Court via CM/ECF. Those attorneys who are registered with the Court's electronic filing system may access this filing through the Court's CM/ECF system, and notice of this filing will be sent to these parties by operation of the Court's electronic filings system.

Dated: February 16, 2024

By: /s/ Jeffrey Malsch  
Jeffrey Malsch  
[jmalsch@renzullilaw.com](mailto:jmalsch@renzullilaw.com)

**LORBER, GREENFIELD & POLITO, LLP**  
3930 E. Ray Road, Suite 260, Phoenix, AZ 85044  
Telephone (602) 437-4177 / Facsimile (602) 437-4180